



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/729,651	12/04/2000	Hyun Gi Choi	9983.106US01	3074

23552 7590 10/03/2002

MERCHANT & GOULD PC
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

MAHMOUDI, HASSAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/729,651

Applicant(s)

CHOI ET AL.

Examiner

Tony Mahmoudi

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 7-14 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The Abstract contains more than 150 words.

The Abstract contains the word "discloses" in line 1.

Corrections are required.

3. The specification of the disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 5, line 1: "for another method" should be deleted because on page 4, line 25 ends with "for a method".

Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feldmeier et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,414) in view of MeLampy (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,186.)

As to claim 1, Feldmeier et al teaches an internet address system structure for introducing a telephone network number system (see Abstract), comprising:

a top level aggregation identifier field (see column 6, lines 9-22.)

Feldmeier et al does not teach a telephone number code field classified based on a telephone number system.

MeLampy et al teaches a telecommunications switching system (see Abstract), in which he teaches a telephone number code field classified based on a telephone number system (see figure 7, and see column 16, lines 35-46.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Feldmeier et al to include a telephone number code field classified based on a telephone number system.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Feldmeier et al by the teaching of MeLampy et al because including a telephone number code field classified based on a telephone number

Art Unit: 2175

system would enable the system to expand the telephone number systems via the Internet, hence, being able to reach (provide access to) users an expanded area throughout the Internet accessible area.

As to claim 2, Feldmeier et al as modified teaches wherein the telephone number code field comprises:

a country code field for distinguishing the respective countries (see MeLampy et al, column 16, line 37);

an area code field for distinguishing domestic areas (see MeLampy et al, column 16, line 38);

a central office code field for identifying the central office serving the subscriber (see MeLampy et al, column 16, line 38, where “central office” reads on “phone number field”);
and

a station number field for identifying a particular station in the central office code (see MeLampy et al, column 16, lines 38-39, where “station number” is read on “extension field”).)

As to claim 3, Feldmeier et al as modified teaches wherein IPv6 address system is used as the internet address system (see Feldmeier, column 6, lines 63-67) and E.164 number system is used as the telephone network number system (see Feldmeier et al, column 8, lines 36-43.)

Art Unit: 2175

As to claim 4, Feldmeier et al teaches a hierarchical routing method (see Abstract) using an internet address system introducing a telephone network number system, wherein a routing process is performed in the internet address system (see column 8, lines 57-64, where “telephone number system” is read on “communication system”), by using the telephone number system, the hierarchical routing process (see column 8, lines 11-14) being integrated or segmented according to the respective steps of the telephone number system in countries worldwide (see column 8, lines 1-3.)

Feldmeier et al does not teach the telephone number system consisting of hierarchical administrative district codes.

MeLampy et al teaches a telecommunications switching system (see Abstract), in which he teaches the telephone number system consisting of hierarchical (see column 4, lines 55-60) administrative district codes (see column 16, lines 35-46.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Feldmeier et al to include the telephone number system consisting of hierarchical administrative district codes.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Feldmeier et al by the teaching of MeLampy et al because including the telephone number system consisting of hierarchical administrative district codes would enable the system to expand the telephone number systems via the Internet, hence, being able to reach (provide access to) users an expanded area throughout the Internet accessible area.

Art Unit: 2175

As to claim 6, Feldmeier et al as modified teaches wherein IPv6 address system is used as the internet address system (see Feldmeier, column 6, lines 63-67) and E.164 number system is used as the telephone network number system (see Feldmeier et al, column 8, lines 36-43.)

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feldmeier et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,414) in view of MeLampy (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,186) as applied to claims 1-4 and 6 above, and further in view of Kushita (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,518.)

As to claim 5, Feldmeier et al as modified teaches the hierarchical routing process (see Abstract.)

Feldmeier et al as modified does not teach wherein the routine process comprises:

a first step wherein a router of a country code hierarchy identifies a country code, and forwards to a corresponding country;

a second step wherein a router of a domestic area code hierarchy identifies a domestic area code, and forwards to a corresponding area; and

a third step wherein a router of a central office code hierarchy identifies and routes a destination the same with a corresponding subscriber number.

Kushita teaches a wireless selective calling receiver (see Abstract), in which he teaches:

a first step wherein a router of a country code hierarchy identifies a country code, and forwards to a corresponding country; a second step wherein a router of a domestic area code hierarchy identifies a domestic area code, and forwards to a corresponding area; and, a third step wherein a router of a central office code hierarchy identifies and routes a destination the

Art Unit: 2175

same with a corresponding subscriber number (see column 5, line 62 through column 6, line 10.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Feldmeier et al as modified to include a first step wherein a router of a country code hierarchy identifies a country code, and forwards to a corresponding country; a second step wherein a router of a domestic area code hierarchy identifies a domestic area code, and forwards to a corresponding area; and, a third step wherein a router of a central office code hierarchy identifies and routes a destination the same with a corresponding subscriber number.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Feldmeier et al as modified, by the teaching of Kushita, because including a first step wherein a router of a country code hierarchy identifies a country code, and forwards to a corresponding country; a second step wherein a router of a domestic area code hierarchy identifies a domestic area code, and forwards to a corresponding area; and, a third step wherein a router of a central office code hierarchy identifies and routes a destination the same with a corresponding subscriber number, would enable the system to assign codes to countries, cities, areas, and locations, and be able to identify the routing areas via the assigned codes, and be able to route calls properly to the designated countries, cities, areas, and locations throughout the world.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 7-10 and 11-14 are allowed over the prior art made of record.

8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record, Feldmeier et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,414), MeLampy (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,186), and Kushita (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,518), do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim):

an internet address system introducing a zip code system, comprising:

a top level aggregation identifier field;

a zip code field classified by the zip code system; and

a subscriber identification number field which is a final identifier field, as claimed in claim 7.

The prior art of record, Feldmeier et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,414), MeLampy (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,186), and Kushita (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,518), do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim):

a hierarchical routing method using an internet address system introducing a zip code system, wherein a routing process is performed in the internet address system, by using the zip code system consisting of hierarchical administrative district codes, the hierarchical routing process being integrated or segmented according to the respective steps of the zip code system in countries worldwide, as claimed in claim 11.

Art Unit: 2175

Claims 8-10 are allowed because they are dependent from the allowed independent claim 7.

Claims 12-14 are allowed because they are dependent from the allowed independent claim

11.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of art with respect to methods and systems hierarchical Internet addressing systems and information identification and information routing in general:

U.S. Patent No. 5,185,785 to Funk et al.

U.S. Patent No. 5,806,057 to Gormley et al.

U.S. Patent No. 6,266,405 to Madour et al.

U.S. Patent No. 6,385,193 to Civanlar et al.


10. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Mahmoudi whose telephone number is (703) 305-4887. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 08:00 am to 04:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (703) 305-3830.

Art Unit: 2175

tm

September 18, 2002


DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100